

Commissioner for Patents  
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 3, 2005  
Page 17


Serial No.: 10/036,998

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to FIGS. 1 and 7.


Attachment: Annotated Sheet(s) showing Changes.

Appl. No. 10/036,998  
 Amdt. Dated Nov. 2, 2005  
 Reply to Office Action of Aug. 3, 2005  
 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes



**FIG. 1**

Appl. No. 10/036,998  
Amdt. Dated Nov. 2, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of Aug. 3, 2005  
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

**FIG. 7**

Commissioner for Patents  
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 3, 2005  
Page 18

Serial No.: 10/036,998

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

The Office Action expresses an opinion that Applicant elected the invention 1.d without traverse. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The election of species 1.d was a species election. As set forth in the Office Action, upon allowance of a generic claim, Applicant will be entitled to consideration of these species claims. In the response dated May 6, 2005, Applicant cancelled claim 18. This was in response to the restriction requirement. Species 1.d was elected in the response as required under 35 U.S.C. 121. As will be discussed in more detail below, generic claims are entitled to allowance. Accordingly, claims 1-17 should be considered.

#### ***Specification***

The Office Action objected to the disclosure for certain informalities. In the corrected paragraphs attached hereto, numbering corresponds to the numbering of the amendments to the disclosure submitted on May 5, 2005, which corrected certain of those informalities. The balance of the informalities is corrected in the amendments to the specification attached hereto.

#### ***Drawings***

The Office Action objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for failure to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. With respect to the call duration report, Applicant respectfully disagrees. The call duration report is shown in Fig. 7 at 196. With respect to the database, the description clearly states that the database is a database of application server 22 (Fig. 1). Nonetheless, Fig. 1 is amended to show the database in the drawings.

With respect to the call request message, Fig. 7 at 182 is amended to correct "call request" to read --call request message--. Replacement pages and marked-up pages showing changes made are attached hereto. Applicant respectfully submits that the drawings now comply with 37 CFR 1.83(a).

The drawings were further objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4). With respect to the reference character (210), it has been corrected to read --218-- which indicates the EISUP trunk shown in Fig. 1.

Commissioner for Patents  
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 3, 2005  
Page 19

Serial No.: 10/036,998

With respect to reference character 68 and 74, all references to the electronic certificate have been corrected to read --74--. With respect to paragraph 65, the paragraph is amended to include the reference 177.

With respect to the description of Fig. 5b, paragraph 44, line 4 has been amended to include the reference 100. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the drawings now comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4).

#### ***Claim Objections***

The Office Action objected to the claims on the grounds that claim 1 referred to pre-paid/prepaid call credit while other claims refer to call credit. The claims are amended to consistently refer to pre-paid call credits.

With respect to claims 2 and 10 "icon" is amended to read --call icon--.

With further respect to claim 10, the phrase "Internet Protocol (IP) Address" is amended to read -- electronic mail address --.

With respect to claim 14, "CCN", which is defined in the description as filed, has been amended to read --call control node--.

With respect to claim 15, "using the call duration" is amended to read --using the call duration report--.

With respect to claims 1, 2 and 10, Applicant has carefully reviewed and amended the disclosure to ensure consistency. All occurrences of certificate are amended to read --electronic certificate--, with the exception of "certificate redemption server" which is not synonymous with the electronic certificate as would be understood by any person skilled in the art.

With respect to the electronic certificate, Applicant respectfully submits that the contents and use of the electronic certificate as described in this application document is explained in detail and would be readily understood by any person skilled in the art. The phrase "electronic certificate" as used in this application is an electronic document that evidences ownership.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2, 10, 12 and 14-15 as being unpatentable over Karas et al. in view of Elliot et al.

Commissioner for Patents  
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 3, 2005  
Page 20

Serial No.: 10/036,998

As per claim 1, claim 1 is cancelled and the rejection is traversed. With respect to claim 2, claim 2 is amended to include the subject matter of claim 1 and Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 2 is neither taught nor suggested by any combination of Karas et al. and Elliot et al.

Amended claim 2 claims sending a copy of the electronic certificate to the recipient via email using the email address, wherein the electronic certificate includes a call icon used for initiating calls to be charged against the pre-paid call credit associated with the electronic certificate.

Karas et al. teach an electronic gift greeting which may be used to send to a recipient a payment that may be used to redeem a prepaid phone card (see paragraph 0019). As taught by Karas et al., the recipient must redeem the electronic gift greeting to obtain the prepaid phone card. The prepaid phone card is then used as phone cards are known to be used by interacting directly with telephones equipped to handle the prepaid phone cards.

Elliott et al. disclose a voice over data telecommunications network architecture. Elliot makes reference to prepaid phone cards but does not teach or suggest an electronic certificate including a call icon for use for initiating calls to be charged against pre-paid call credits. The rejection of claim 2 is thereby respectfully traversed.

With respect to claim 10, claim 10 claims receiving at an application server a call request as a result of an action by the recipient [of the electronic certificate] who activates the call icon. As explained above with reference to claim 2, this is neither taught nor suggested by any combination of Karas et al. and Elliott et al. Furthermore, with respect to sending a call request message to a call control node, the referenced text of Elliott et al. in column 140 describes a media gateway, well known to those skilled in the art. The media gateway serves as a bridge between a switched telephone network and Internet Protocol network. A media gateway is neither adapted to, nor capable of originating calls.

With respect to the reference to column 2, line 57 to column 3, line 8, the initiation of a call using a telephone connected to an originating end office switch is described. The process is well understood in the art and would not lead any person of ordinary skill in the art to the initiation of a call from a call control node as described in the instant application and claimed in claim 10. The rejection of claim 10 is thereby respectfully traversed.

Commissioner for Patents  
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 3, 2005  
Page 21

Serial No.: 10/036,998

With respect to claim 12, the arguments set forth above regarding claims 2 and 10 apply and the rejection of claim 12 is traversed.

With respect to claim 14, the reference to Elliott et al. at column 1, lines 22-56 is not understood. The referenced text teaches how a switched circuit telephone network reserves a dedicated channel for each call for the duration of the call whether or not any information is actually being transmitted over the channel. This is to illustrate the difference between a switched circuit telephone network and an Internet Protocol data network, which does not reserve dedicated channels for a call because all data transfer is asynchronous. In any event, no combination of Karas et al. and Elliott et al. teach a call control node, or reporting from the call control node to the application server a duration of the call after the telephone communication is completed. The rejection of claim 14 is thereby traversed.

As per claim 15, Karas et al. do not teach calculating a charge for a telephone call using a call duration report. The referenced text teaches a transfer fee or a fee charged to a gift certificate target store. This would not lead any person skilled in the art to the claimed limitation. Nor does Karas et al. teach deducting a charge from a remaining value of the credit and updating a remaining value. Karas et al. teach that their electronic gift greeting is "cashed in" in a single transaction. Any charges incurred prior to that transaction or as a result of that transaction are, in accordance with Karas et al., deducted before the transaction in which the recipient receives the gift.

With respect to the teachings of Elliott et al., Elliott et al. teach standard telephone billing procedures implemented in a voice over an Internet Protocol network. Elliott et al. neither teach nor suggest receiving at the application server from the call control node via a data network a call duration report associated with a unique identifier [contained in an electronic certificate]. The rejection of claim 15 is thereby traversed.

With respect to claims 16 and 17, the arguments set forth above in detail apply and it is respectfully submitted that claims 16 and 17 clearly and inventively distinguish over the teachings of Karas et al. and Elliott et al.

Commissioner for Patents  
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 3, 2005  
Page 22

Serial No.: 10/036,998


In view of the amendments made to the specification, drawings and claims, this application is now considered to be in a condition for immediate allowance. Favourable reconsideration and earlier issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

L. LLOYD WILLIAMS

Dated: November 2, 2005.

By:



Frederick S. Burkhart  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 29 288

VAN DYKE, GARDNER, LINN & BURKHART, LLP  
2851 Charlevoix Drive S.E., Suite 207  
P.O. Box 888695  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49588-8695 U.S.A.  
Tel.: 616-988-4104



Commissioner for Patents  
Reply to Office Action Mailed August 3, 2005  
Page 23

Serial No.: 10/036,998

## **APPENDIX A**